

UNITED STATES DISTRICT COURT  
WESTERN DISTRICT OF WASHINGTON  
AT SEATTLE

MARK DAVISCOURT,

Plaintiff,

v.

GWANNETTE M. CLAYBROOK.,  
*et. al*,

Defendants.

CASE NO. C18-1148 RAJ

ORDER

This matter comes before the court on *pro se* Plaintiff Mark DavisCourt's "MOTION for Extension of Time to Reply to Defendants Bortnick, Stebbins and Isenberg's Response to Original Complaint" ("Motion for Extension of Time") and "MOTION to Enlarge Time to Effect Service of Process and Allow Alternative Service of Process by Mail for Unserved Defendants" ("Motion to Enlarge Time"). Dkt. ## 21, 22. Defendants have responded to each motion. Dkt. ## 26, 27. For the reasons that follow, the Court **GRANTS IN PART AND DENIES IN PART** Plaintiff's Motion for an Extension of Time (Dkt. # 21), and **DENIES** Plaintiff's Motion to Enlarge Time (Dkt. # 22).

1 **I. DISCUSSION**

2 **A. Motion for Extension of Time (Dkt. # 21)**

3 Plaintiff's first Motion for an Extension of Time requests an extension of 60 days  
4 to respond to certain Defendants' "reply to the original Complaint." Dkt. # 21 at 1. The  
5 contents of the Motion, however, make it clear that Plaintiff is effectively requesting a  
6 60-day extension to respond to Defendants' Motion to Dismiss, filed on January 28,  
7 2019. Dkt. # 18. Defendants indicate that they do not object to a 30 day extension, but  
8 argue that a 60 day extension is too long given the circumstances of this case. Dkt. # 26.

9 The Court agrees, and will **GRANT IN PART AND DENY IN PART** Plaintiff's  
10 Motion for Extension of Time. Dkt. # 21. At this time, the Court finds good cause to  
11 extend the deadline by 30 days. Fed. R. Civ. P. 4. Should Plaintiff require more time, he  
12 may request another extension, so long as the new motion complies with the Federal  
13 Rules, this District's Local Civil Rules, and this Court's Standing Order. *See* Dkt. # 3 at  
14 4.

15 **B. Motion to Enlarge Time (Dkt. # 22)**

16 Plaintiff's second Motion to Enlarge Time requests additional time to serve  
17 various unserved Defendants via mail. Dkt. # 22. On February 5, 2018, W. Carl Hankla  
18 appeared on behalf of these previously unserved Defendants. Dkt. # 19. Moreover, these  
19 Defendants note that they have each waived personal service. Dkt. # 27.

20 Accordingly, the Court **DENIES** Plaintiff's Motion to Enlarge Time as **MOOT**.  
21 Dkt. # 22.

22 //

23 //

24 //

25 //

26 //

27 //

1 **II. CONCLUSION**

2 Accordingly, the Court **GRANTS IN PART AND DENIES IN PART** Plaintiff's  
3 Motion for an Extension of Time (Dkt. # 21), and **DENIES AS MOOT** Plaintiff's  
4 Motion to Enlarge Time (Dkt. # 22). Plaintiff's time to respond to Defendants' Motion to  
5 Dismiss (Dkt. # 18) is hereby extended to thirty (30) days from the date of this Order.

6  
7 Dated this 27th day of February, 2019.

8  
9 

10 The Honorable Richard A. Jones  
11 United States District Judge  
12  
13  
14  
15  
16  
17  
18  
19  
20  
21  
22  
23  
24  
25  
26  
27